

that if the railroad in which he is interested is under C.N.R. control, close to \$2,000,000 will be spent in the Atlantic district.

Mr. GAGNON: The minister cannot then state any definite amount for the Chicoutimi area in particular?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No, I cannot.

(Text):

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On section 5—Power to aid other companies.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Will the minister please look at the first line of this section, which reads:

The national company may aid and assist, in any manner, any other or others of the said companies—

And so on. I suggest that this is going quite outside the limitations of section 2, though if that is so I am sure it is quite unintentional. I think that should read, "in any manner not inconsistent with the terms of section 2", because surely this is a broadening out.

Mr. MAYHEW: I am told that this wording is exactly the same as it has been for some years.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Do we never want to make any improvements? This is for the purpose of improving it.

Mr. MAYHEW: The suggestion will be brought to the attention of the minister.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): That does not affect my comment. I should like to ask the Minister of Transport in his legal capacity if I am not correct.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is just the comment I was making to my hon. friend. I would not want to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman, but I was saying that the question is whether it would be an improvement. In matters such as these we have to take the advice of the Department of Justice, which has gone over this bill and approved it. In view of that fact I feel that the interpretation we have placed upon it is the correct one.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): I suppose it is always possible that even the Department of Justice may overlook something. I am not suggesting that it is a mighty matter, but I am confident that I am right, and it seems to me it might be worth while, if it could be done, to let this section stand and refer the matter to the Department of Justice.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I suggest to the hon. gentleman that in view of the fact that this has been the wording over the years, the hon. gentleman allow it to go through, and I will make it my business to discuss the question with the Department of Justice to see if, in the bill which will come up next year, it may not be possible to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the minister what "said" companies are these? I do not see any except the national railways.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The subsidiary companies of the railway.

Section agreed to.

Sections 6 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

FISHERIES RESEARCH BOARD

PROVISION FOR SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND OTHER OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The house resumed from Friday, June 6, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bridges for the second reading of Bill No. 264, to amend the Fisheries Research Board Act.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): In rising to speak on this bill to amend the Fisheries Research Board Act, let me at the outset commend the minister for introducing this legislation and for the amendments proposed therein. I want to take the opportunity now, which I did not have last session, to disabuse the mind of the minister, if I have to, and the minds of hon. members with regard to my attitude toward research and the fisheries research board. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am one of those who believe in research; and if I offered some criticism last year I have no apology for having done so, because I had one object in view. As one who has been here for eighteen years, and since the inception of the fisheries research board, I realized that some startling statements had to be made, and that I or someone had to make it strong if we hoped that any attention would be paid to the criticisms offered. I had no animosity against the personnel of the board; there was nothing personal in the remarks I made last year. I want to make it clear that I am in favour of research, and in favour of expending even more money for that purpose. But I was not in favour nor am I of the way the moneys were being expended under the direction of the fisheries research board. Therefore I am